State Dependent and Independent cloner: Cloning and Broadcasting

Manish Kumar Shukla,[1] Indranil Chakrabarty, [2] Sourav Chatterjee [1]
[1] *Center for Computational Natural Sciences and Bioinformatics, International Institute of Information Technology-Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Hyderabad-500032, India. and*
[2] *Center for Security Theory and Algorithmic Research International Institute of Information Technology-Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, India.*

In this work, we extensively study the problem of broadcasting of entanglement. In the first part of the work, we reconceptualize the idea of state dependent quantum cloning machine, and in that process we introduce different types of state dependent cloners like static and dynamic state dependent cloners. We derive the conditions under which we can make these cloners independent of the input state. In the broadcasting part, as our resource initial state, we start with general two qubit state and consider specific examples like, non maximally entangled state (NME), Werner like state (WS), and Bell diagonal state (BDS). We apply both state dependent/ state independent cloners, both locally and non-locally, in each of these cases. Incidentally, we find several instances where state dependent cloners outperform state independent cloners in broadcasting. This work gives us a holistic view on the broadcasting of entanglement in various two qubit states, when we have an almost exhaustive sets of cloning machines in our arsenal.

arXiv:1511.05796v1 [quant-ph] 18 Nov 2015

1. INTRODUCTION

The laws of quantum mechanics in one hand gives us a huge technological boost from the classical world in accomplishing various information processing tasks.[1–9], while on the other hand impose restrictions on the kind of transformation we can implement on quantum states.These restrictions are given in form of theorems like no cloning theorem[10], no deletion theorem[11] and many others [12–16], No cloning theorem prohibits us from cloning an unknown quantum state perfectly[10]. Nevertheless given the impossibility of proper cloning, in the year 1996, Buzek *et. al.* went beyond this to introduce the idea of approximate cloning [10, 17–23] with certain fidelity of success. Approximate quantum cloning machines further can be of two types, a) state dependent [10, 20, 24], b) state independent [17, 19]. In state dependent quantum cloners the performance of the cloning machine is dependent on the state to be cloned, whereas in state independent quantum cloners the performance is independent of the input state parameters.The performance of state dependent cloners can be better than state independent cloners for some input states, but on average state independent performs better than state dependent cloners. In addition to this, we have probabilistic quantum cloning machines, with which we can clone an unknown quantum state, secretly chosen from a certain set of linearly independent states, with a certain non vanishing probability of success $p(0 < p < 1)$[23, 25, 26].
Entanglement which lies at the heart of quantum mechanics acts as a resource in most of the information processing tasks like quantum cloning[27]. In general these resources are mixed entangled states [6, 28] in comparison to pure entangled states [30, 31]. However there are always requirement of pure entangle states as resource for better achievement of these tasks. The process of distilling pure entanglement form the available mixed entangled states have been studied extensively [32, 33]. Interestingly, the requirement is not unidirectional. In a network we frequently require more number of states with less entanglement than a single state of greater entanglement. This process of creating more entangled states from an initial entangled state can be achieved in various ways. In general when we achieve this with the aid of local and non local cloning transformations, we call it broadcasting of entanglement[34, 35]
Buzek et. al. showed that though perfect broadcasting of entanglement is forbidden as a consequence of no cloning theorem, yet partial decompression of initial quantum entanglement is possible, i.e., for a pair of entangled particle two less entangled pairs can be obtained[34]. In this context it was shown by Bandyopadhyay et. al. that only universal quantum cloning machines which have fidelity greater than $\frac{1}{2}(1+\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}})$ can broadcast entanglement[36]. There is also a bound on the number of copies that can be created, which is two if we use local cloning and six if we use non-local cloning[36]. Recently we have shown that it is impossible to even partially broadcast quantum correlation that goes beyond entanglement by using both local and non local quantum copying machines[37]. In the same work we extensively study the broadcasting of quantum entanglement for various two qubits mixed states.
In this work, in section 2 we first discuss about various types of cloning, i.e. state dependent, state independent, local and non local. While discussing about state dependent cloning, we define two kinds of state dependence, namely, static and dynamic state dependent cloning. We also compare the performance of above stated cloners. We start the next section with definition of broadcasting using cloning transformations and develop a deeper insight on broadcasting using local and non local cloning. In the next subsection, we consider the general two qubit state and study the broadcasting of en-

tanglement with three examples namely, non maximally entangled (NME)[31], Werner like state (WS)[28, 29], Bell diagonal state (BDS).

2. QUANTUM CLONING BEYOND NO CLONING THEOREM

The no-cloning theorem states that given an arbitrary quantum state $|\psi\rangle$, there do not exists any complete positive trace preserving map(CPTP) $\mathcal{C}$ which will produce two copies of $|\psi\rangle$ as an output when applied on the state itself, $\mathcal{C} : |\psi\rangle \nrightarrow |\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle$. Although perfect cloning is not possible, it never rules out the possibility to clone the quantum states approximately with a fidelity,

$$F = \langle\psi|\rho^{out}|\psi\rangle\,, \tag{1}$$

ρ^{out} being the state obtained at the output port after applying the cloning transformation.The most celebrated of all these cloning machines is the B-H cloning machine (U_{bh}) which is a M-dimensional quantum copying transformation acting on a state $|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_0}$ ($i = 1, ..., M$). This state is to be copied on a blank state $|0\rangle_{a_1}$. Initially, the copying machine is in state $|X\rangle_x$ which subsequently get transformed into another set of state vectors $|X_{ii}\rangle_x$ and $|Y_{ij}\rangle_x$. Here a_0, a_1 and x represent the input, blank and machine qubits respectively. In this case, these transformed state vectors belong to the orthonormal basis set in the M-dimensional space. The transformation scheme U_{bh} is given by [19],

$$\begin{aligned} U_{bh}\,|\Psi_i\rangle_a\,|0\rangle_a\,|X\rangle_x &\to c\,|\Psi_i\rangle_a\,|\Psi_i\rangle_b\,|X_{ii}\rangle_x \\ &+d\sum_{j\neq i}^{M}\left(|\Psi_i\rangle_a\,|\Psi_j\rangle_b + |\Psi_j\rangle_a\,|\Psi_i\rangle_b\right)|Y_{ij}\rangle_x\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where i, $j = \{1, ..., M\}$, and the coefficients c and d are real. The coefficients c and d are the probability amplitude associated with the probability of successfully getting the copied state or not.

Another way to express the general M dimensional Buzek-Hillery quantum cloning machine, from which we can easily derive the state dependent cloner is as follows. Here, M refers to the dimensionality of m qubit system, so $M = 2^m$. The general pure state in M dimensions can be expressed as $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i|\psi_i\rangle$, where ψ_i are the basis vectors of the m qubit system. The cloning transformation is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_i\rangle|\Sigma\rangle|X\rangle &\to |\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle|X_{ii}\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{M}(|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_j\rangle + |\psi_j\rangle|\psi_i\rangle)|Y_{ij}\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here we have substituted $c = 1, d = 1$, and have introduced the following unitarity conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle &= 1 - 2(M-1)\lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle &= 0, i \neq j, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= \lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= 0, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{kl}\rangle &= 0, i \neq k, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{jk}\rangle &= \mu/2, i \neq j. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Now onwards, we consider both these quantities λ and μ as machine parameters. The complete density matrix of the combined output state after tracing out machine states is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ab}^{out} &= (1-2(M-1)\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i\alpha_i^*(|\psi_i\rangle_a\langle\psi_i| \otimes |\psi_i\rangle_b\langle\psi_i|) \\ &+\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i\alpha_i^*\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{M}|\chi_{ij}\rangle\langle\chi_{ij}| + \frac{\mu}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{M}\alpha_j^* \\ &\sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{M}(|\psi_i\rangle_a|\psi_i\rangle_b\langle\phi_{jk}| + |\phi_{jk}\rangle\langle\psi_i|_a\langle\psi_i|_b). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Here, $|\chi_{ij}\rangle = (|\psi_i\rangle_a|\psi_j\rangle_b + |\psi_j\rangle_a|\psi_i\rangle_b)$ and $|\phi_{jk}\rangle = (|\psi_j\rangle_a|\psi_k\rangle_b + |\psi_k\rangle_a|\psi_j\rangle_b)$. After tracing out we get the new cloned state at the output port as,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a^{out} = \rho_b^{out} &= (1-2(M-1)\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i\alpha_i^*|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \\ &+\frac{\mu}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i\sum_{j=1,i\neq j}^{M}\alpha_j^*(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| + |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_i|) \\ &+\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{M}\alpha_i\alpha_i^*\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{M}(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| + |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We introduce two quantities, $D_{ab} = tr[\rho_{ab}^{(out)} - \rho_a^{(id)} \otimes \rho_b^{(id)}]^2$ and $D_a = tr[\rho_a^{(out)} - \rho_a^{(id)}]^2$ to quantify the amount of distortion in the combined system and the individual system as a result of cloning. Here $\rho_a^{(id)}$ and $\rho_b^{(id)}$ are the states if cloning was ideal, that is, $\rho_a^{(id)} = \rho_b^{(id)} = \rho_a^{(in)}$. To get the relation between λ and μ we use the following condition $\frac{\partial D_a}{\partial \alpha_i^2} = 0$, it basically makes D_a independent of input state. For the M dimensional case we get

$$\mu = 1 - M\lambda \tag{7}$$

When we substitute μ with $1 - M\lambda$ we find that the distortion D_a reduces to

$$D_a = M(M-1)\lambda^2 \tag{8}$$

To calculate the optimal value of the machine parameter λ, we make $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ to get λ for which the value of D_{ab}

is minimum. This is to ensure that the machine parameter selected should be the one, which leads to minimum distortion in actual complete output obtained and the ideal output that should have been obtained. Now when we have a cloning transformation for m qubts, we can apply these to study the effect of cloning on teleportation , broadcasting, discord, coherence and compare the results for initial state and state after cloning. The challenge here is to find a criteria similar to Peres-Horodecki criteria to detect entanglement for m qubit system. In this work we have used Buzek-Hillery (B-H) QCM as the basic cloning machine and built upon it to get the state dependent cloning machine.

2.1. State dependent cloner

In general we can copy an unknown quantum states with some imperfections. Cloning machines can be classified into two groups based on kind of imperfection they create. If the performance of the cloning machine is dependent on the input state i.e. if the cloner performs good for some state and bad for some other state the cloning machine is called state dependent(SDC). Now we can define state dependence by relaxing the condition $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \alpha_i^2} = 0$, so now we don't have one value of λ for which the cloning fidelity is independent of the input state parameters. Here instead we calculate $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ which gives the condition for optimality i.e. we get values of optimal λ as a function of input state parameters, this leads to two kinds of state dependent cloning machines and hence two definitions for state dependent cloning follows.

2.1.1. Static state dependent cloner(SSDC)

A static state dependent cloning machine is one whose value of optimal machine parameter is a fixed constant value. When we clone the given input state the complete output state obtained after tracing out the machine states is a function of input states(α^2) as well as machine state parameters (λ and μ). To obtain the relation between between λ and μ we impose the condition that D_a is independent of input parameters, i.e. $\frac{\partial D_a}{\partial {\alpha_i}^2} = 0$. The relation obtained is given in equation (7), D_a hence obtained is independent of input parameters and is only dependent on machine parameter λ. So for a cloning machine with fixed machine parameter the value of D_a remains same irrespective of input state which is being cloned, this cloner is state dependent in the sense the value of D_{ab} is state dependent.

To give a better understanding of this type of cloning we first prepare a static cloning machine and use it to study cloning in single qubit case. The general single qubit pure state can be expressed as $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle (\alpha^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1)$.

We use the following cloning transform,

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle|\Sigma\rangle|X\rangle &\rightarrow |0\rangle|0\rangle|X_{00}\rangle + (|0\rangle|1\rangle + |1\rangle|0\rangle)|Y_1\rangle \\ |1\rangle|\Sigma\rangle|X\rangle &\rightarrow |1\rangle|1\rangle|X_{11}\rangle + (|1\rangle|0\rangle + |0\rangle|1\rangle)|Y_0\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $|\Sigma\rangle$ represent one qubit blank state and $|X\rangle$, $|Y\rangle$ represent machine states. We trace out the machine state to get the complete output state ρ_{ab}^{out} and impose following conditions,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle &= 1 - 2\lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle &= 0, i \neq j, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= \lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= 0, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{kl}\rangle &= 0, i \neq k, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{jk}\rangle &= \mu/2, i \neq j. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The complete output state (ρ_{ab}^{out}) is given by,

$$\rho_{ab} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^2(1-2\lambda) & \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} & \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} & \lambda & \lambda & \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} \\ \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} & \lambda & \lambda & \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} & \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\mu}{2} & (1-\alpha^2)(1-2\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$$

, and the reduced output state(ρ_a^{out}) is given by,

$$\rho_a^{out} = \rho_b^{out} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^2(1-2\lambda) + \lambda & \alpha\beta\mu \\ \alpha\beta\mu & \beta^2(1-2\lambda) + \lambda \end{bmatrix}.$$

The distortion in the reduced output state is given by, $D_a = Tr[\rho_a^{out} - \rho_a^{id}]^2$, where ρ_a^{id} is same as ρ_a^{in}. The D_a in this case is given by,

$$D_a = 2(1-2\alpha^2)^2\lambda^2 - 2(\alpha^2-1)\alpha^2(\mu-1)^2 \tag{11}$$

The relation obtained when we apply the condition $\frac{\partial D_a}{\partial \alpha^2}$, we get $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$ and when we substitute this value in expression of D_a we get $D_a = 2\lambda^2$. It is evident that D_a is independent of input parameters and only dependent on machine parameter λ.
Next, we calculate $D_{ab} = Tr[\rho_{ab}^{out} - \rho_a^{id} \otimes \rho_b^{id}]^2$ where $\rho_b^{id} = \rho_a^{in}$. When we substitute $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$, we obtain,

$$D_{ab} = 2(1-2\alpha^2)\alpha^2 + 12(\alpha^2-1)\lambda\alpha^2 + 8\lambda^2. \tag{12}$$

To obtain the completely state independent version of this of this cloner we can impose additional condition that D_{ab} is also input state independent, i.e. $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \alpha^2} = 0$. When we follow thw stated procedure we get that when $\lambda = \frac{1}{6}$, D_{ab} is independent of input parameters and is equal to constant value $\frac{2}{9}$. Here we are interested in the state dependent version of cloner so instead we obtain the optimal machine state parameter, which is obtained by making $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$. The equation of the optimal machine state parameter obtained is given by[24],

$$\lambda_{optimal} = \frac{3\alpha^2(1-\alpha^2)}{4} \tag{13}$$

Now we can construct various static state dependent cloning machines by substituting values of input state parameters in equation (13). Table I shows how we can construct different static state dependent cloning machines and their respective distortions.

Machine	α^2	λ_{SSDC}	$D_{a_{SSDC}}$
M_1	0.1	0.0675	0.0091
M_2	0.2	0.12	0.0288
M_3	0.3	0.1575	0.0496
M_4	0.4	0.18	0.0648
M_5	0.5	0.1875	0.0703
M_6	0.6	0.18	0.0648
M_7	0.7	0.1575	0.0496
M_8	0.8	0.12	0.0288
M_9	0.9	0.0675	0.0091

TABLE I: λ_{SSDC} are machine parameters of various static state dependent cloning machines(M_1 to M_9). $D_{a_{SSDC}}$ is the distortion in reduced state when any input state is cloned using the respective static state dependent cloner

If we select one of these cloning machines (say M_1 with $\lambda = 0.0675$) and use it to clone the general single qubit pure state, its performance in terms of D_a and D_{ab} is given in Table II.

α^2	λ_{SSDC}	$D_{a_{SSDC}}$	$D_{ab_{SSDC}}$
0.1	0.0675	0.0091	0.1436
0.2	0.0675	0.0091	0.2269
0.3	0.0675	0.0091	0.2864
0.4	0.0675	0.0091	0.3221
0.5	0.0675	0.0091	0.3340
0.6	0.0675	0.0091	0.3221
0.7	0.0675	0.0091	0.2864
0.8	0.0675	0.0091	0.2269
0.9	0.0675	0.0091	0.1436

TABLE II: Performance of SSDC M_1 for various input states.

2.1.2. Dynamic state dependent cloner(DSDC)

A dynamic state dependent cloning machine is one where the value of optimal machine parameter is not fixed for a machine rather it changes dynamically according to the state being cloned. Unlike the case of static state dependent cloning machine, here we do not need to create many cloning machines, rather we have only one cloning machine which can chose the value of optimal machine parameter according to the state being cloned. To get a better understanding, we use the same example as in case of static state dependent cloning. We have the same functions for D_a and D_{ab}. Now when we substitute $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$ and the value of λ from equation (13) we get,

$$\begin{aligned} D_a &= \frac{9}{8}\alpha^4(1-\alpha^2)^2 \\ D_{ab} &= \frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2(4-9(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In Table III we show the performance of dynamic state dependent cloning machine when it is used to clone various single qubit quantum states. We can see here that both D_a and D_{ab} change when the input state is changed.

α^2	λ_{DSDC}	$D_{a_{DSDC}}$	$D_{ab_{DSDC}}$
0.1	0.0675	0.0091	0.1436
0.2	0.12	0.0288	0.2048
0.3	0.1575	0.0496	0.2216
0.4	0.18	0.0648	0.2208
0.5	0.1875	0.0703	0.2188
0.6	0.18	0.0648	0.2208
0.7	0.1575	0.0496	0.2216
0.8	0.12	0.0288	0.2048
0.9	0.0675	0.0091	0.1436

TABLE III: λ_{DSDC} are machine parameters of dynamic state dependent cloning machine. $D_{a_{DSDC}}$ is the distortion in reduced state and $D_{ab_{DSDC}}$ is the distortion in complete output state.

In the context of broadcasting, when a specific static state dependent cloning machine with a fixed value of optimal machine parameter is used, we obtain a range of values of input parameters, where the broadcasting of entanglement is possible. When a different static state dependent cloning machine with a different optimal machine parameter is used, we obtain a different range of input parameters where broadcasting is possible. On the other hand, if we use a dynamic state dependent cloning machine we obtain a single range of values of input parameters where broadcasting is possible. This is because when a input state is supplied to the cloner for broadcasting, the cloner automatically selects the optimal machine parameter according to the input state.

2.1.3. Local cloner

Now let us try to clone the combined state of two quantum systems. There can be two ways of doing this, first where we apply the cloning transformation on state of each particle individually which is called as local cloning or we can apply a single cloning transform on combined two particle state of the system which is as called nonlocal cloning. Let the input state be,

$$\rho_{ab} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^2 & 0 & 0 & \alpha\beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 & 0 & \beta^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

then the reduced density matrix representing each of these subsystems will be

$$\rho_a = \rho_b = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, if parties a and b apply the cloning transformation on their individual system, which is given by equation (9), we refer it as local cloning. We trace out the machine states using conditions given in equation (10) to get the complete output state. The local cloner can be seen as cloning transformation in 2 dimensions, that is M=2 so we get $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$. In order to calculate the value of optimal λ we calculate $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$, where $D_{ab} = tr[\rho_{ab}^{(out)} - \rho_a^{(id)} \otimes \rho_b^{(id)}]^2$.

2.1.4. Non-local cloner

The other way to clone the two qubit state would be to apply a global cloning transformation and this is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}|00\rangle|\Sigma\rangle|X\rangle \rightarrow |00\rangle|00\rangle|X_{00}\rangle + (|00\rangle|01\rangle + |01\rangle|00\rangle)|Y_{01}\rangle + \\ (|00\rangle|10\rangle + |10\rangle|00\rangle)|Y_{02}\rangle + (|00\rangle|11\rangle + |11\rangle|00\rangle)|Y_{03}\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Here $|\Sigma\rangle$ represents blank state and $|X\rangle$, $|Y\rangle$ represent machine states. Similarly we can also write the clonig transformations for rest of the basis vectors $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$. We trace out the machine states to get the complete output state ρ_{abcd} and impose following conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle &= 1 - 4\lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle &= 0, i \neq j, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= \lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= 0, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{kl}\rangle &= 0, i \neq k, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{jk}\rangle &= \mu/2, i \neq j.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The non-local cloner here, can be seen as cloning transformation in 4 dimensions, that is M=4 so we get $\mu = 1-4\lambda$. In order to calculate the value of optimal λ we calculate $\frac{\partial D_{abcd}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$, where $D_{abcd} = tr[\rho_{abcd}^{(out)} - \rho_{ab}^{(id)} \otimes \rho_{cd}^{(id)}]^2$.

2.2. State independent cloner

If a cloning machine performs same for any input state it is called state independent quantum cloning machine. The optimal state independent version of the B-H cloner (U_{bhsi}) can be obtained by imposing following conditions, $\langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle = \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ji}\rangle = 1$, $\langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \langle Y_{ji}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle = 0$ and the output state obtained after cloning can be expressed in the form $\rho_a^{out} = s|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \frac{1-s}{4}\mathbb{I}$, where $|\psi\rangle$ is the original input state, s is the classical mixing parameter, which tells about the quality of cloning and $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix. After imposing these conditions and selecting the transformation for which D_a is minimum we get values of coefficients c and d as follows,

$$c^2 = \frac{2}{M+1}, d^2 = \frac{1}{2(M+1)} \tag{17}$$

Another way to derive state-independence for the cloner described in equation (3), where c=1, d=1 but we have following conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle &= 1 - 2(M-1)\lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle &= 0, i \neq j, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= \lambda, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle &= 0, \\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{kl}\rangle &= 0, i \neq k, \\ \langle X_{ii}|Y_{jk}\rangle &= \mu/2, i \neq j,\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

To get the value of λ for which the performance of cloner becomes independent of the input state, we apply following conditions $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \alpha_i^2} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial D_a}{\partial \alpha_i^2} = 0$ where $D_{ab} = tr[\rho_{ab}^{(out)} - \rho_a^{(id)} \otimes \rho_b^{(id)}]^2$, $D_a = tr[\rho_a^{(out)} - \rho_a^{(id)}]^2$ and α_i^2 are the input state parameters. Solving this we get value of machine parameter $\lambda = \frac{1}{2(M+1)}$. For the case of local and non local cloner described in the section above we get $\lambda = \frac{1}{6}$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{10}$ respectively.

2.3. Comparative analysis of state dependent and state independent cloner

In this subsection we give a comparative analysis of both dynamic state dependent(DSDC) and state independent cloners in terms of the distortion of the reduced output state for both local(DSDLC and SIL) and non local case(DSDNL and SINL). In Table IV we show the comparison between state dependent and state independent cloner. We have used $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ as input state when we are performing local cloning [24] and $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$ while performing non-local cloning. We obtain optimal λ for local case using equation (13) and for non local case using equation (38). We note that when dynamic state dependent local cloner (DSDLC) is used, the distortion in reduced output state (D_a) is less than the case when state independent local cloner (SILC) is used, when α^2 is $0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$ and D_a is greater for $DSDLC$ when α^2 is $0.4, 0.5, 0.6$. Next, when we use non local cloning then the values of D_a for dynamic state dependent (DSDNLC) cloner are higher than state independent cloner (SINLC), when α^2 is $0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7$ and lower when α^2 is $0.1, 0.2, 0.8, 0.9$. For the general M-dimensional state-independent non-local case we have,

$$D_a = \frac{M(M-1)}{4(M+1)^2}. \tag{19}$$

α^2	λ_{DSDLC}	$D_{a_{DSDLC}}$	$D_{a_{SIL}}$	λ_{DSDNL}	$D_{a_{DSDNLC}}$	$D_{a_{SINL}}$
0.1	0.0675	0.0091	0.0556	0.0480	0.0276	0.12
0.2	0.12	0.0288	0.0556	0.0844	0.0855	0.12
0.3	0.1575	0.0496	0.0556	0.1099	0.1449	0.12
0.4	0.18	0.0648	0.0556	0.125	0.1875	0.12
0.5	0.1875	0.0703	0.0556	0.13	0.2028	0.12
0.6	0.18	0.0648	0.0556	0.125	0.1875	0.12
0.7	0.1575	0.0496	0.0556	0.1099	0.1449	0.12
0.8	0.12	0.0288	0.0556	0.0844	0.0855	0.12
0.9	0.0675	0.0091	0.0556	0.0480	0.0276	0.12

TABLE IV: Comparative analysis of dynamic state dependent local (DSDLC), state independent local (SIL), dynamic state dependent non local (DSDNLC) and state independent non local (SINL) cloning machines.

In the section below we have compared the performance of state dependent cloners, both static and dynamic, when applied locally or non locally to study broadcasting of entanglement.

3. BROADCASTING OF QUANTUM ENTANGLEMENT VIA CLONING

3.1. Broadcasting

Broadcasting of entanglement refers to a situation where from a given entangled state we can create multiple entangled states by applying unitary transformations, both locally and non locally. There are several ways to implement this however, the most predominant way is the one when we use both local and non local cloning machines. It is the reverse process of distilling pure entangled states from mixed entangled states. Though perfect broadcasting of quantum entanglement is prohibited as a consequence of no cloning theorem, however it is always possible to partially broadcast quantum entanglement with the help of both types of cloning transformations. When we refer to the broadcasting of entanglement, we generally talk about creating more pair of lesser entangled states from the initial entangled state. Our basic aim is to broadcast the amount of entanglement present in the given input state to many pairs. The procedure we follow to achieve this is to take an entangled state ρ_{12} and a blank state, apply the cloning transformation and trace out the machine state to get the complete output state ρ_{1234}. Ideally, broadcasting of entanglement would be possible if we are able to generate more number of entangled pairs from it. However optimal broadcasting of entanglement between non-local outputs we must not have any entanglement between local output states.

Definition 3.1. *Optimal local broadcasting:* An entangled state ρ_{12} is said to be optimally broadcast after the application of local cloning operation $U1 \otimes U2$ (each of the type given by 3) on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively, if for some values of the input state parameters,

- the non local output states between A and b

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{14}^{out} &= Tr_{23}[U1 \otimes U2\rho_{12}] \\ \rho_{23}^{out} &= Tr_{14}[U1 \otimes U2\rho_{12}] \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

  are inseparable, and

- the local output states of A and B

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{13}^{out} &= Tr_{24}[U1 \otimes U2\rho_{12}] \\ \rho_{24}^{out} &= Tr_{13}[U1 \otimes U2\rho_{12}] \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

  are separable.

Definition 3.2. *Optimal non local broadcasting:* An entangled state ρ_{12} is said to be optimally broadcast after the application of non local cloning operation U_{12} (given by 3) together on the qubits 1 and 2, if for some values of the input state parameters,

- the desired output states,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{12}^{out} &= Tr_{34}[U_{12}\rho_{12}] \\ \rho_{34}^{out} &= Tr_{12}[U_{12}\rho_{12}] \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

  are inseparable,

- and the remaining output states

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{13}^{out} &= Tr_{24}[U_{12}\rho_{12}] \\ \rho_{24}^{out} &= Tr_{13}[U_{12}\rho_{12}] \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

  are separable.

Without any loss of generality we have chosen the non local output states to be $\rho_{12}^{out}, \rho_{34}^{out}$, instead of which we could always have chosen ρ_{14}, ρ_{23}.

The necessary and sufficient condition for entanglement in $2\otimes2$ and $2\otimes3$ is given by Peres-Horodecki criteria[38]. It states that for a state to be inseparable, at least one of the eigenvalue of the partially transposed state $\rho^{'} = \rho^{T}$ should be negative. If all the eigenvalues of the partially transposed state are positive, then the state is separable. This can be equivalently expressed by the condition that the value of at least one of the two determinants,

$$W_{44} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{00,00} & \rho_{01,00} & \rho_{00,10} & \rho_{01,10} \\ \rho_{00,01} & \rho_{01,01} & \rho_{00,11} & \rho_{01,11} \\ \rho_{10,00} & \rho_{11,00} & \rho_{10,10} & \rho_{11,10} \\ \rho_{10,10} & \rho_{11,01} & \rho_{10,11} & \rho_{11,11} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$W_{33} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{00,00} & \rho_{01,00} & \rho_{00,10} \\ \rho_{00,01} & \rho_{01,01} & \rho_{00,11} \\ \rho_{10,00} & \rho_{11,00} & \rho_{10,10} \end{bmatrix}$$



FIG. 1: The first figure shows the broadcasting of the state ρ_{12} into ρ_{14} and ρ_{23} by application of local cloning unitary transformations U_1 and U_2 on both sides. The second figure shows the broadcasting of the state ρ_{12} into ρ_{12} and ρ_{34} by application of non local cloning unitary transformation U_{12} on complete state.

is negative, with

$$W_{22} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{00,00} & \rho_{01,00} \\ \rho_{00,01} & \rho_{01,01} \end{bmatrix}$$

being simultaneously non-negative.

3.2. General two qubit state

In this subsection we make a systematic study of broadcasting of entanglement present in two qubit states, starting with a general representation of two qubit state written in terms of Bloch vectors and correlation matrix followed by, specific examples like non maximally entangled state(NME), Werner state(WS) and Bell diagonal state(BDS). In this context we have used various cloning machines like state independent local(SILC), static state dependent local(SSDLC), dynamic state dependent local(DSDLC), state independent non local(SINLC), static state dependent non local(SSDNLC) and dynamic state dependent non local(DSDNLC) cloning machines. The general two qubit state represented in terms of Bloch vector and correlation matrix is expressed as,

$$\rho_{12} = \frac{1}{4}\Big[\mathbb{I}_4 + \sum_{i=1}^{3}(x_i\sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_2 + y_i\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_i) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} t_{ij}\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j\Big] = \{\vec{x}, \vec{y}, T\}, \tag{24}$$

where $x_i = Tr[\rho_{12}(\sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_2)]$, $y_i = Tr[\rho_{12}(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_i)]$, $t_{ij} = Tr[\rho_{12}\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j]$, σ_i are $2 \otimes 2$ Pauli matrices. I_n is the identity matrix of order n and i can take values $\{1, 2, 3\}$. In the simplified expression, $\vec{x}$,$\vec{y}$ are Bloch vectors and $T = [t_{ij}]$ is the correlation matrix.
Let us consider a situation where qubit 1 is with Alice and qubit 2 is with Bob. We apply two local cloners U_1, U_2 on ρ_{12} with blank state $|\Sigma\rangle_3$ on Alice's side and $|\Sigma\rangle_4$ on Bob's side. On tracing out we get the local output states $\rho_{13}^{out} = Tr_{24}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12} \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_3 \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_4)]$ and $\rho_{24}^{out} = Tr_{13}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12} \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_3 \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_4)]$. The non local output states are given by $\rho_{14}^{out} = Tr_{23}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12} \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_3 \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_4)]$ and $\rho_{23}^{out} = Tr_{14}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12} \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_3 \otimes |\Sigma\rangle_4)]$. First of all, we consider the case when we apply state independent local cloners (SILC) independently on each of these qubits 1 and 2. The local and the non local output states are respectively given by,

$$\rho_{13}^{out} = \left\{\frac{2}{3}\vec{x}, \frac{2}{3}\vec{x}, \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{I}_3\right\}, \rho_{24}^{out} = \left\{\frac{2}{3}\vec{y}, \frac{2}{3}\vec{y}, \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{I}_3\right\}, \tag{25}$$

$$\rho_{14}^{out} = \rho_{23}^{out} = \left\{\frac{2}{3}\vec{x}, \frac{2}{3}\vec{y}, \frac{4}{9}T\right\}. \tag{26}$$

Secondly, we consider the case when we use state dependent local cloners (SDLC). In this situation the local and the non local outputs obtained after cloning are given by,

$$\rho_{13}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{x}, \mu\vec{x}, T_l^{sd}\right\}, \rho_{24}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{y}, \mu\vec{y}, T_l^{sd}\right\}, \tag{27}$$

$$\rho_{14}^{out} = \rho_{23}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{x}, \mu\vec{y}, \mu T\right\}, \tag{28}$$

where T_l^{sd} =diag$[2\lambda, 2\lambda, 1-4\lambda]$, T is the input state correlation matrix and μ, λ are the machine parameters as usual. For local cloning these machine parameters are related by $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$. It is interesting to note that these output states are same whether we use static or dynamic state dependent cloning machine (SSDLC / DSDLC).
Next, we consider the case when we have the non local cloners. In case of non local cloning we apply single cloner on the combined two qubit state instead of two different cloners locally. The output states obtained in this process are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{12}^{out} &= Tr_{34}[U_{12}\rho_{12}], \\ \rho_{34}^{out} &= Tr_{12}[U_{12}\rho_{12}], \\ \rho_{13}^{out} &= Tr_{24}[U_{12}\rho_{12}], \\ \rho_{24}^{out} &= Tr_{13}[U_{12}\rho_{12}]. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The local and the non local output states obtained in case of state independent cloning transformations are given by,

$$\rho_{13}^{out} = \left\{\frac{3}{5}\vec{x}, \frac{3}{5}\vec{x}, \frac{1}{5}\mathbb{I}_3\right\}, \rho_{24}^{out} = \left\{\frac{3}{5}\vec{y}, \frac{3}{5}\vec{y}, \frac{1}{5}\mathbb{I}_3\right\}, \tag{30}$$

$$\rho_{12}^{out} = \rho_{34}^{out} = \left\{\frac{3}{5}\vec{x}, \frac{3}{5}\vec{y}, \frac{3}{5}T\right\}. \tag{31}$$

Finally when we apply state dependent cloning transformations on both the qubits together, the local and the

non local output states obtained as a result of this, are given by,

$$\rho_{13}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{x}, \mu\vec{x}, T_{nl}^{sd}\right\}, \rho_{24}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{y}, \mu\vec{y}, T_{nl}^{sd}\right\}, \quad (32)$$

$$\rho_{12}^{out} = \rho_{34}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{x}, \mu\vec{y}, \mu T\right\}. \quad (33)$$

Here, matrix T_{nl}^{sd} is a $3X3$ diagonal matrix, with the diagonal elements being $2\lambda, 2\lambda, 1-8\lambda$. Here T is the same input state state correlation matrix. However, the machine parameters μ and λ are related differently from the local cloning case as $\mu = 1-4\lambda$. It is needless to mention that even in the non local case, the outputs obtained as a result of both static and dynamic cloning operations are identical.

3.2.1. Non-Maximally entangled state(NME)

Here, we specifically consider the problem of broadcasting non-maximally entangled state (NME), $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$ where α, β are probability amplitudes ($\alpha^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$). We use state independent(SIC), static state dependent(SSDC) and dynamic state dependent cloning(DSDC) machines, both locally(SILC. SSDLC, DSDLC respectively) and non locally(SINL, SSDNLC, DSDLC respectively), for the purpose of broadcasting. We also compare broadcasting ranges of each of the above stated cloners from different tables(V, VI) and figure(2). The same non maximally entangled state (NME) can be expressed in terms of Bloch vector and correlation matrix as $\rho_{12}^{nm} = \left\{\vec{x}^{nm}, \vec{x}^{nm}, T^{nm}\right\}$, where $\vec{x}^{nm} = \{0, 0, (\alpha^2 - \beta^2)\}$ and $T^{nm} = diag[2\alpha\beta, -2\alpha\beta, 1]$.

a. ***Local static state dependent and state independent cloners:*** The output states obtained as a result of state dependent cloning transformations (static/dynamic) are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{13}^{out} = \rho_{24}^{out} = \left\{\mu\vec{x}^{nm}, \mu\vec{x}^{nm}, T_l^{sd}\right\} \\ , \rho_{14}^{out} = \rho_{23}^{out} = \left\{\mu x^{\vec{nm}}, \mu x^{\vec{nm}}, \mu T^{nm}\right\}.\end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

We have already seen in section 2.2, the value of λ obtained for local cloning to make the cloning machine state independent is $\frac{1}{6}$. In order to make a static state dependent cloning machine, we first have to calculate optimal value of λ.To calculate optimal λ, we make $\frac{\partial D_{13}}{\partial\lambda} = 0$, where $D_{13} = Tr[\rho_{13}^{out} - \rho_1^{id} \otimes \rho_3^{id}]$ is the distortion in the combined state. Now, there can be two ways in which we can introduce static state dependence here. In the first method, we prepare a state dependent cloning machine for a general pure single qubit quantum state and use it locally to clone non-maximally entangled state. If we use this method then the expression for optimal lambda reduces to $\lambda = \frac{3\alpha^2(1-\alpha^2)}{4}$. The other way to use state dependent cloning machine would be to prepare it according to the state which is to be cloned, that is, the single qubit state obtained after tracing out the other qubit from the combined density matrix of non-maximally entangled state, $\rho_1 = Tr_2[\rho_{12}]$, where $\rho_{12} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. In this work, we restrict our discussion to second definition of state dependence for both static and dynamic cloning. The optimal λ obtained in this case is given by,

$$\lambda_{optimal} = \frac{\alpha^2(1-\alpha^2)}{2(1-\alpha^2+\alpha^4)}. \quad (35)$$

We have used various values of α^2 ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 with uniform interval of 0.1, to get the values of optimal machine parameter for various static state dependent cloners. We observe that due to symmetry in the non-maximally entangled state, that is, if we interchange the values of α^2 and β^2 (say value of α^2 is 0.1, then value of $\beta^2 = 0.9$ or if value of α^2 is 0.9, then value of $\beta^2 = 0.1$), this should essentially give me same optimal machine parameter. We have used the values of optimal machine parameters obtained by above method to find the broadcasting range of the non maximally entangled states. To find the broadcasting, range we apply PPT criteria to see for what values of α^2 ρ_{13}, ρ_{24} are separable and ρ_{14}, ρ_{23} are inseparable. In table V we show the comparison between static state dependent(SSDLC) and state independent local cloner(SILC) in terms of broadcasting ranges. It is evident that all the static state dependent cloning machines perform better than the state independent version. This is because we obtain $\lambda = \frac{1}{6}$ in case of state independent local cloning when we are cloning pure state, but the actual state on which the local cloner is acting in case of non maximally entangled (NME) state is a mixed state, which is obtained when we trace out the other system $\rho_1 = Tr_2[\rho_{12}]$. In case of static state dependent local cloners, we obtain machine parameters from equation (35), which considers the original input states as mixed states.

Machine	λ_{SSDLC}	Range (SSDLC)	Range (SILC)
M_1	0.0494	$0.0034<\alpha^2<0.9966$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_2	0.0952	$0.0176<\alpha^2<0.9824$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_3	0.1329	$0.0480<\alpha^2<0.9520$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_4	0.1578	$0.0885<\alpha^2<0.9120$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_5	0.1666	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_6	0.1578	$0.0885<\alpha^2<0.9120$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_7	0.1329	$0.0480<\alpha^2<0.9520$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_8	0.0952	$0.0176<\alpha^2<0.9824$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$
M_9	0.0494	$0.0034<\alpha^2<0.9966$	$0.1097<\alpha^2<0.8903$

TABLE V: Comparison of broadcasting ranges of static state dependent(SSDLC) and state independent(SILC) local cloners

b. ***Non local state independent and static state dependent:*** Next, we study static state dependent(SSDNLC) and independent(SINLC) non-local cloners. The local output states obtained by non-local state dependent cloners is given by,

$$\rho_{13}^{out} = \rho_{24}^{out} = \left\{\mu x^{\vec{nm}}, \mu x^{\vec{nm}}, T_{nl}^{sd}\right\} \tag{36}$$

and the inseparable output states are given by,

$$\rho_{12}^{out} = \rho_{34}^{out} = \left\{\mu x^{\vec{nm}}, \mu x^{\vec{nm}}, \mu T^{nm}\right\}, \tag{37}$$

where $\mu = 1 - 4\lambda$. On substituting $\lambda = 1/10$, we get the optimal state independent cloner. In case of state dependent cloner, we calculate value of optimal machine parameter by calculating $\frac{\partial D_{1234}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$, where $D_{1234} = Tr[\rho_{1234}^{out} - \rho 12^{id} \otimes \rho_{34}^{id}]^2$,

$$\lambda_{optimal} = \frac{13\alpha^2(1-\alpha^2)}{4(6+\alpha^2-\alpha^4)} \tag{38}$$

Table VI gives the comparison between static state dependent and state independent non local cloning machines for the task of broadcasting. We see similar trends as in local case, that is, as the value of λ increases, broadcasting range decreases. Maintaining the symmetry, lambda again decreases and broadcasting range increases. Initially, broadcasting range for state dependent cloner is more than state independent cloner, then it decreases and attains a minimum value and then again increases to become higher than state independent. Here, non local state dependent cloning machines M_1, M_2, M_8, M_9 perform better than state independent cloning machine and M_3, M_4, M_5, M_6, M_7 perform worse than state independent cloning machine.

Machine	λ_{SSDNLC}	Range (SSDNLC)	Range (SINLC)
M_1	0.0480	$0.0035<\alpha^2<0.9965$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_2	0.0844	$0.0165<\alpha^2<0.9835$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_3	0.1099	$0.0401<\alpha^2<0.9599$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_4	0.125	$0.0670<\alpha^2<0.9330$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_5	0.13	$0.0797<\alpha^2<0.9203$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_6	0.125	$0.0670<\alpha^2<0.9330$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_7	0.1099	$0.0401<\alpha^2<0.9599$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_8	0.0844	$0.0165<\alpha^2<0.9835$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$
M_9	0.0480	$0.0035<\alpha^2<0.9965$	$0.0286<\alpha^2<0.9714$

TABLE VI: Comparison of broadcasting ranges for static state-dependent(SSDNLC) and state independent(SINLC) non-local cloner

c. ***Dynamic cloner:*** The last kind of cloner we discuss is dynamic state dependent cloner. In this case, the value of λ is automatically selected by the machine according to the input state. So a machine, instead of having a fixed machine parameter, has a variable one which takes optimal value for the given input automatically. To do this we first obtain the condition for broadcasting by using PPT criterion, the condition obtained is in terms of λ and α^2 and now we substitute the value of optimal λ, which is a function of α^2, to obtain the condition for broadcasting entirely in terms of α^2. The broadcasting range obtained using these cloners, both locally and non-locally, is same and that is the entire range of the input parameter α^2.

Figure (2) shows the broadcasting range(R= upper limit of α^2 - lower limit of α^2) on y axis and k on x-axis. k is the value of α^2 used to create various static state dependent cloners. It is evident that non-local cloners are better than local cloners and state dependent cloners are better than state independent ones for some values of α^2. Dynamic state dependent cloner is the best amongst all, as it gives the largest broadcasting range.



FIG. 2: The figure shows the broadcastable region of non maximally entangled state(NME) when various cloners are used. Purple → state independent local cloner, blue → various static state dependent local cloners, black → various static state dependent non local cloners, orange → state independent non local cloner and red → dynamic state dependent cloner for both local and non-local cloning.

3.2.2. Werner like state

The second example we consider here is Werner-like state, $\rho_{12}^{w} = p|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \frac{1-p}{4}\mathbb{I}_4$. Here $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$ is non maximally entangled state, with 'p' being the classical randomness and $\mathbb{I}_4$ being the identity operator. The same state can be expressed in terms of the Bloch vectors and correlation matrix as, $\rho_{12}^{w} = \left\{\vec{x}^w, \vec{x}^w, T^w\right\}$, where $\vec{x}^w = \{0, 0, p(\alpha^2 - \beta^2)\}$ and $T^w = \text{diag}[2p\alpha\beta, -2p\alpha\beta, p]$.

a. ***Static state dependent and state independent local cloning:*** Local and non local output states obtained after local state-dependent cloning are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{13}^{out} = \rho_{24}^{out} &= \left\{\mu\vec{x}^w, \mu\vec{x}^w, T_l^{sd}\right\},\\ \rho_{14}^{out} = \rho_{23}^{out} &= \left\{\mu x^{\vec{w}}, \mu x^{\vec{w}}, \mu T^w\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Like before to get the state independent output, we substitute $\lambda = 1/6$. The optimal value of λ for state dependent cloner is obtained by equating the partial derivative of D_{13} ($D_{13} = Tr[\rho_{13}^{out} - \rho_1^{id} \otimes \rho_3^{id}]$, $\rho_1^{id} = \rho_3^{id} = Tr_2[\rho_{12}^w]$) with respect to λ to zero, i.e. $\frac{\partial D_{13}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$.
The optimal machine parameter λ obtained in this way is given by,

$$\lambda_{optimal} = \frac{p^2(4\alpha^4 - 4\alpha^2 + 1) - 1}{2(3 + p^2(4\alpha^4 - 4\alpha^2 + 1))}. \tag{40}$$

We apply Peres-Horodecki criteria to find out the broadcasting range i.e. the range of values for which ρ_{13}^{out} (ρ_{24}^{out}) is separable and ρ_{14}^{out} (ρ_{23}^{out}) is inseparable. These ranges for each of these static state dependent machines (SSDLC) are obtained by substituting the values of machine parameters λ. The parameter k is the value of α^2 we have used to create various static state dependent cloners and the broadcasting ranges (R) obtained for each of these cloners are in terms of allowed values of p and α^2 are shown in figure (3). We note that broadcasting range (R) in terms of α^2 increases as p increases and it is maximum when $p = 1$. We also note that as the value of k increases from 0.1 to 0.5 the broadcasting range decreases and when k goes from 0.5 to 0.9 the broadcasting range again increases.



FIG. 3: The figure shows the broadcastable region of Werner like state in terms of input parameters α^2 and p when different static state dependent local cloners are used for different choices of k.

b. ***Static state dependent and state independent non local cloning:*** Next, we use non-local cloners for the purpose of broadcasting entanglement. The local and the non local output states obtained in this process are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{13}^{out} = \rho_{24}^{out} &= \left\{ \mu x^{\vec{w}}, \mu x^{\vec{w}}, T_{nl}^{sd} \right\}, \\ \rho_{12}^{out} = \rho_{34}^{out} &= \left\{ \mu x^{\vec{w}}, \mu x^{\vec{w}}, \mu T^w \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

For the state independent part, to make the machine free form the input state, we substitute once again $\lambda = \frac{1}{10}$. Coming back to state dependent cloning, we follow the same procedure to get the optimal values of λ as,

$$\lambda_{optimal} = \frac{-3 + p^2(34\alpha^4 - 34\alpha^2 - 3) + 6p^3(3\alpha^4 - 3\alpha^2 + 1)}{2(-15 + p^2(8\alpha^4 - 8\alpha^2 - 33))} \tag{42}$$

Like before, to construct the different state dependent cloners we selective values of α^2 and we relabel it as the parameter k. In figure (4) we plot the broadcastable region in terms of the parameter α^2 and p for different values of k. It is interesting to note that static state dependent non local (SSDNL) cloning machines perform better than the static state dependent local cloning (SSDLC) machines for each values of the parameter k. This is a clear indication of the the fact that once we fix the cloning machine it is always the machine will have a greater broadcasting range in non local case compared to the local situation. From both the figures (4, 3), it is evident that the state is not broadcastable for all values of p.



FIG. 4: The figure shows the broadcastable region of Werner like state in terms of input parameters α^2 and p when different static state dependent non local cloners are used for different choices of k.

Henceforth, we take three values of p $(0.65, 0.80, 0.95)$ uniformly from the broadcastable region and construct three corresponding tables (VII, VIII, IX), where in each of them we compare the broadcastable range for both state local (SSDLC) and non local (SSDNLC) cloning machines, corresponding to the choice of different machines for different values of k. When we use state independent cloning machines to broadcast entanglement the ranges obtained in local case are $0.288 < \alpha^2 < 0.711$ and $0.135 < \alpha^2 < 0.0.864$ for $p = 0.80$ and $p = 0.95$ respectively. We cannot broadcast entanglement using local state independent cloners when $p = 0.65$. When non

local state independent cloning machines are used the ranges obtained are $0.188<\alpha^2<0.811$, $0.07<\alpha^2<0.92$ and $0.03<\alpha^2<0.96$ for $p = 0.65, 0.80, 0.95$ respectively. It is interesting to note that for any value of p, the broadcasting range in terms of allowed values of α^2 for all static state dependent local cloners are better than state independent local cloner.

k	λ_{SSDLC}	SSDLC	λ_{SSDNLC}	SSDNLC
0.1	0.1115	$0.183<\alpha^2<0.816$	0.0744	$0.098<\alpha^2<0.90$
0.2	0.1344	$0.32<\alpha^2<0.67$	0.0968	$0.172<\alpha^2<0.827$
0.3	0.1519	False	0.1125	$0.281<\alpha^2<0.718$
0.4	0.1629	False	0.1218	False
0.5	0.1666	False	0.1249	False
0.6	0.1629	False	0.1218	False
0.7	0.1519	False	0.1125	$0.281<\alpha^2<0.718$
0.8	0.1344	$0.32<\alpha^2<0.67$	0.0968	$0.172<\alpha^2<0.827$
0.9	0.1115	$0.183<\alpha^2<0.816$	0.0744	$0.098<\alpha^2<0.90$

TABLE VII: Comparison of broadcasting ranges for various static state-dependent local and non local cloner when $p = 0.65$.

k	λ_{SSDLC}	SSDLC	λ_{SSDNLC}	SSSDNLC
0.1	0.0865	$0.044<\alpha^2<0.955$	0.0633	$0.029<\alpha^2<0.97$
0.2	0.1191	$0.09<\alpha^2<0.908$	0.0920	$0.064<\alpha^2<0.93$
0.3	0.1446	$0.163<\alpha^2<0.837$	0.1122	$0.113<\alpha^2<0.886$
0.4	0.1610	$0.244<\alpha^2<0.755$	0.1242	$0.165<\alpha^2<0.83$
0.5	0.1666	$0.288<\alpha^2<0.711$	0.1282	$0.189<\alpha^2<0.81$
0.6	0.1610	$0.244<\alpha^2<0.755$	0.1242	$0.165<\alpha^2<0.83$
0.7	0.1446	$0.163<\alpha^2<0.837$	0.1122	$0.113<\alpha^2<0.886$
0.8	0.1191	$0.09<\alpha^2<0.908$	0.0920	$0.064<\alpha^2<0.93$
0.9	0.0865	$0.044<\alpha^2<0.955$	0.0633	$0.029<\alpha^2<0.97$

TABLE VIII: Comparison of broadcasting ranges for various static state-dependent local and non local cloners when p=0.80.

k	λ_{SSDLC}	SSDLC	λ_{SSDNLC}	SSDNLC
0.1	0.0590	$0.007<\alpha^2<0.992$	0.0518	$0.006<\alpha^2<0.994$
0.2	0.1015	$0.027<\alpha^2<0.972$	0.0864	$0.023<\alpha^2<0.97$
0.3	0.1360	$0.065<\alpha^2<0.934$	0.1106	$0.050<\alpha^2<0.94$
0.4	0.1587	$0.111<\alpha^2<0.888$	0.1250	$0.083<\alpha^2<0.916$
0.5	0.6666	$0.135<\alpha^2<0.864$	0.1297	$0.097<\alpha^2<0.090$
0.6	0.1587	$0.111<\alpha^2<0.888$	0.1250	$0.083<\alpha^2<0.916$
0.7	0.1360	$0.065<\alpha^2<0.934$	0.1106	$0.050<\alpha^2<0.94$
0.8	0.1015	$0.027<\alpha^2<0.972$	0.0864	$0.023<\alpha^2<0.97$
0.9	0.0590	$0.007<\alpha^2<0.992$	0.0518	$0.006<\alpha^2<0.994$

TABLE IX: Comparison of broadcasting ranges for various static state-dependent local and non local cloners when $p = 0.95$.

c. ***Local and non local dynamic cloning:*** Lastly, we use dynamic state dependent cloner(DSDLC, DSDNLC for local and non local respectively), where the value of optimal machine parameter is automatically selected by the machine. This is based on the input state according to equation(40) for the local case and equation (42) for the non local case. In table X, we take the different values of α^2 and compare the range of values of where broadcasting is possible in both cases of state independent and dynamic state dependent cloners. Interestingly, we find that dynamic state dependent local cloner gives a larger range of values of p where broadcasting is possible than state independent local cloner. However, in case of non local cloners the scenario is different. For $\alpha^2 = 0.1, 0.2, 0.8, 0.9$ dynamic state dependent cloners perform better than state independent cloners, whereas for other values of α^2 the findings are other way round.

In a nutshell we find that in most of the cases state dependent cloners perform better at least in terms of the broadcasting range compared to the state independent cloners when we take Werner like state(WS), as our initial resource entangled state.

α^2	SILC	DSDLC	SINLC	DSDNLC
0.1	False	$0.71<p\leq1$	$0.75<p\leq1$	$0.64<p\leq1$
0.2	$0.865<p\leq1$	$0.70<p\leq1$	$0.64<p\leq1$	$0.62<p\leq1$
0.3	$0.794<p\leq1$	$0.71<p\leq1$	$0.58<p\leq1$	$0.64<p\leq1$
0.4	$0.760<p\leq1$	$0.73<p\leq1$	$0.56<p\leq1$	$0.66<p\leq1$
0.5	$0.75<p\leq1$	$0.75<p\leq1$	$0.55<p\leq1$	$0.67<p\leq1$
0.6	$0.760<p\leq1$	$0.73<p\leq1$	$0.56<p\leq1$	$0.66<p\leq1$
0.7	$0.794<p\leq1$	$0.71<p\leq1$	$0.58<p\leq1$	$0.64<p\leq1$
0.8	$0.865<p\leq1$	$0.70<p\leq1$	$0.64<p\leq1$	$0.62<p\leq1$
0.9	False	$0.71<p\leq1$	$0.75<p\leq1$	$0.64<p\leq1$

TABLE X: Range of values of p for values of α^2 where broadcasting of entanglement is possible when state independent and dynamic state dependent cloners are used locally and non locally.

In figure (5) shows the broadcastable region when various types of cloners are used. The brown region shows the area where original input state ρ_{12}^{w} (Werner like state) are inseparable. All broadcastable zones obtained as a result of different cloning transformations must be a subset of this. This is because the broadcasting of entanglement only makes sense, in the region where original input state is entangled. the purple and the gray semi-circular regions are the broadcastable zones obtained when local and non local state independent cloners are used. The black and blue region in between show the broadcastable regions when dynamic state dependent cloners are used locally (DSDLC) and non locally (DSDNLC) respectively.



FIG. 5: The figure shows the broadcastable zone for Werner like state (WS) when various cloners are used. Brown → region where ρ_{12}^{w} is inseparable, purple → state independent local cloning, black → dynamic state dependent local cloning, blue → dynamic state dependent non local cloning and gray → state independent non local cloning.

3.2.3. Bell Diagonal state

As a last example, we consider the broadcasting of Bell diagonal state which is given by $\rho_{12}^{b} = p_1|\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+| + p_2|\psi_-\rangle\langle\psi_-| + p_3|\phi_+\rangle\langle\phi_+| + p_4|\phi_-\rangle\langle\phi_-|$, where p_1, p_2, p_3 and p_4 are classical mixing parameters. Here, $|\psi_\pm\rangle, |\phi_\pm\rangle$ are Bell states. In terms of Bloch vectors and correlation matrix, Bell diagonal states can also be expressed as,

$$\rho_{12} = \left\{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T^b\right\} \tag{43}$$

where $\vec{0}$ is the null matrix and $T^b = \text{diag}[\ c_1, c_2, c_3\ ]$ $(-1 \leq c_i \leq 1)$ is the correlation matrix.

a. ***Static state dependent and state independent local cloning:*** The local and non local output states obtained as a result of state dependent local cloning are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{13}^{out} = \rho_{24}^{out} &= \left\{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T_l^{sd}\right\}, \\ \rho_{14}^{out} = \rho_{23}^{out} &= \left\{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mu T^b\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

It is interesting to note that for local cloning the optimal value of λ is $\frac{1}{6}$, whether we use state dependent or state independent cloning transformation. We present this result in form of the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *In local cloning on bell diagonal state using state dependent cloner, there is only one possible value of optimal machine parameter, which is equal to machine parameter for state independent case.*

Proof. The local output state obtained by local state dependent cloning is given by,

$$\rho_{13}(\rho_{24}) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1-2\lambda) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}(1-2\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$$

. The distortion of the combined output state is a function of machine parameter λ only, where in most of the cases, it is a function of machine parameter and input parameter. This distortion of the combined state is given by,

$$D_{13} = \frac{1}{4} - 2\lambda + 6\lambda^2. \tag{45}$$

When we take the first derivative of D_{13} with respect to λ, we obtain $\lambda = \frac{1}{6}$. The second derivative test shows that this is the value of λ corresponding to minimum value of D_{13} for both state independent and state dependent cloner. □

In table (XI) we show the broadcasting range for the state independent and state dependent local cloners, in terms of the parameter c_3, for chosen values of the parameters c_1, c_2. These ranges happen to be same for both the cloners, as their optimal value of the machine parameter is equal.

c_1	c_2	SILC	SDLC
$-\frac{7}{8}$	$-\frac{7}{8}$	-1$\leq c_3 < -\frac{3}{4}$	-1$\leq c_3 < -\frac{3}{4}$
$-\frac{3}{4}$	$-\frac{3}{4}$	-1$\leq c_3 < -\frac{3}{4}$	-1$\leq c_3 < -\frac{3}{4}$
$-\frac{7}{8}$	$-\frac{3}{4}$	$-\frac{7}{8} \leq c_3 < -\frac{5}{8}$	$-\frac{7}{8} \leq c_3 < -\frac{5}{8}$
$-\frac{3}{4}$	$-\frac{7}{8}$	$-\frac{7}{8} \leq c_3 < -\frac{5}{8}$	$-\frac{7}{8} \leq c_3 < -\frac{5}{8}$

TABLE XI: Comparative analysis of broadcasting ranges of state dependent local (SDLC) and state independent local cloners (SILC) in terms of c_3 for fixed values of c_1 and c_2.

In the figure (6), we show the broadcastable regions for all types of cloners used in the local case. The inside octahedron represents the zone where there is no entanglement in original bell diagonal state. It is needless to mention that the broadcastable regions would be a subset of the complement part. The four pyramids obtained at the edge of the tetrahedron are the regions where the broadcasting is possible.

b. ***Static state dependent and state independent non local cloning:*** Next, we use state dependent non-local cloner for broadcasting. The local and the non local output states are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{13}^{out} = \rho_{24}^{out} &= \left\{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T_{nl}^{sd}\right\}, \\ \rho_{12}^{out} = \rho_{34}^{out} &= \left\{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mu T^b\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

It is interesting to note that the local output states are not dependent on input state parameters c_1, c_2, c_3. To



FIG. 6: The figure shows the broadcastable region for the bell diagonal state (BDS), when various local cloners are used. Gray → separable input state, brown → broadcastable zone for all cloners and pink → inseparable input state.

calculate the expression for optimal machine parameter in case of state dependent cloner, we calculate $\frac{\partial D_{1234}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ and obtain optimal λ as a function of input parameters,

$$\lambda_{optimal} = \frac{21{c_1}^2 + 6c_1c_2c_3 + 21{c_2}^2 + 4{c_3}^2 + 12}{8\left(12{c_1}^2 + 12{c_2}^2 + 11{c_3}^2 + 15\right)}. \quad (47)$$

In table (XII), we chose values of input parameters c_1, c_2 and c_3 uniformly, to fix a value for optimal machine parameter so that we can use the machine corresponding to the machine parameter obtained, at the time of broadcasting. We use the static state dependent cloning machines to find the broadcasting range in terms of the parameter c_3 for chosen values of c_1 and c_2. These ranges are shown in table (XIII). It is interesting to note that in table (XIII), as the values of the optimal machine parameter increases the broadcasting range decreases and vice-versa.

c. ***Local and non local dynamic state dependent cloning:*** Lastly, we use the dynamic state dependent cloner(DSDNLC) where, when we supply the value of c_1 and c_2, and the optimal machine parameter as a function of C_3 is substituted in the output density matrices, we can use these output matrices to calculate the broadcasting ranges. In the Table XIV we present a comparative analysis of state-dependent dynamic and state independent cloning. We can see that the broadcasting ranges of state dependent are lesser than the state independent ones, but we also notice that for $c_1 = -2/5$ and $c_2 = -2/5$ the range is larger for state dependent cloner and for $c_1 = -1/3$ and $c_2 = -1/3$, the broadcasting is not possible using state independent cloner, however it is possible using state dependent dynamic cloner. In figure (7) we plot the various broadcastable zones when state independent and dynamic state dependent non local cloners are used. The gray octahedron at the center represents the region where the input bell diagonal states are separable. The At the corners the brown pyramid represents the broadcastable zone when state independent non local cloner is used. The black region at the corners shows the broadcastable zone when dynamic state dependent cloner is used. It is evident that none of these regions completely overlaps other, indicating that for some values dynamic state dependent is better and for some other values state independent one is better.

c_1	c_2	c_3	$\lambda_{SSDNLCl}$
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1278
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1391
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1210
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1319
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1210
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1319
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1116
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1219

TABLE XII: Values of optimal machine parameters for various values of input parameters

c_1	c_2	λ_{SSDNLC}	Broadcasting Range
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1278	-1≤ $c_3 < -\frac{5}{9}$
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1391	$-1. \leq c_3 < -0.698728$
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1210	-$\frac{7}{9} \leq c_3 < -0.604651$
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1319	False
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1210	-$\frac{7}{9} \leq c_3 < -0.604651$
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	0.1319	False
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1116	$-1. \leq c_3 < -0.695247$
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	0.1219	$-1. \leq c_3 < -0.840489$

TABLE XIII: Broadcasting range in terms of c_3 when values of c_1, c_2 are fixed for various static state dependent non local cloners.

c_1	c_2	SINL	DSDNLC
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	-1≤ $c_3 < -\frac{5}{9}$	-1≤ $c_3 < -0.62809$
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	-1≤ $c_3 < -\frac{5}{9}$	-1≤ $c_3 < -0.72682$
$-\frac{7}{9}$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	-$\frac{7}{9} \leq c_3 < -\frac{1}{3}$	$-0.77777 \leq c_3 < -0.68061$
$-\frac{5}{9}$	$-\frac{7}{9}$	-$\frac{7}{9} \leq c_3 < -\frac{1}{3}$	$-0.77777 \leq c_3 < -0.68061$
$-\frac{2}{5}$	$-\frac{2}{5}$	$-1. \leq$ c3 < -0.86	$-1. \leq$ c3 < -0.839078
$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	False	$-1. \leq$ c3 < -0.902749

TABLE XIV: Comparison between broadcasting ranges when dynamic state dependent cloner and state independent non local cloners are used



FIG. 7: The figure shows the broadcastable region for the bell diagonal state (BDS), when various non local cloners are used. Gray → separable input state, pink → inseparable input state, brown → broadcastable zone with state independent non local cloning and black → broadcastable zone when dynamic state dependent non local cloner is used.

4. CONCLUSION

In a nutshell, in this work, we reconceptualize the notion of state dependence in quantum cloning. Based on that we introduce, new state dependent cloning machine which, when used locally, outperforms the state independent cloning machines and when used non locally performs better for some value of input parameters. Further, we have defined dynamic state dependent cloning which adjusts the optimal machine parameter according to the input state. It is shown to be better than state independent cloning in context of broadcasting of entanglement by taking various states like non maximally entangled (NME), Werner like (WS), Bell diagonal (BDS) as examples. This new type of state dependent cloning machine opens new possibilities for generating more number of input copies from given input state. In future, it would be interesting, to study broadcasting using asymmetric state dependent cloner[39], both locally and non locally. Also, it would be of interest to study broadcasting of coherence and discord using these state dependent cloners.

[1] A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).

[2] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, System and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, pp.175-179 (1984); P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).

[3] M. Hillery, V. Buzek and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999); S. K. Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, C. Vanarasa and K. Srinathan, arXiv:1311.5378; S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty and P. Agrawal, Quant. Inf. Comp. **12**, 0253 (2012); M.Ray, S. Chatterjee and I. Chakrabarty, arXiv:1402.2383

[4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993); R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **222**, 21 (1996).

[5] C.H.Bennett and S.J.Weisner, Phys.Rev.Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992); R. Nepal, R. Prabhu, A. Sen De and U. Sen, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032336 (2013).

[6] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009), and references therein.

[7] S. Bose, V. Vedral and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 822 (1998); M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne and A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4287 (1993).

[8] Sk Sazim and I. Chakrabarty, Eur. Phys. J. D **67**, 174 (2013).

[9] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2818 (1996); L. Goldenberg and L.Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1239 (1995); A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052312 (2000); C. Li, H-S Song and L. Zhou, Journal of Optics B: Quantum semiclass. opt. **5**, 155 (2003); A. Orieux, G. Ferranti, A. DâĂŹArrigo, R. Lo Franco, G. Benenti, E. Paladino, G. Falci, F. Sciarrino and P. Mataloni, arXiv:1410.3678; A. DâĂŹArrigo, R. Lo Franco, G. Benenti, E. Paladino and G. Falci, Ann. Phys. **350**, 211224 (2014).

[10] W. K.Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802 (1982).

[11] Arun Kumar Pati, Samuel L. Braunstein, Nature **404**, 164-165 (2000).

[12] Arun K. Pati, Barry C. Sanders, Physics Letters A **359**, 31-36 (2006).

[13] I Chattopadhyay, S K. Choudhary, G Kar, S Kunkri, D Sarkar, Phys. Lett. A, **351**, 384-387 (2006).

[14] I Chakrabarty, IJQI **5**, 4 pp. 605-609 (2007).

[15] D.L. Zhou, B. Zeng, L. You, Phys. Lett. A **352**, 41 (2006).

[16] MichaÅĆ Oszmaniec, Andrzej Grudka, MichaÅĆ Horodecki, Antoni WÃşjcik, arXiv:1505.04955 (2015).

[17] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1844 (1996).

[18] N. Gisin and S. Massar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2153 (1997).

[19] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5003 (1998).

[20] D. Bruss, P.D. DiVincenzo, A. Ekert, C. A. Fuchs, C. Macchiavello and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 2368 (1998).

[21] N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4497 (2000).

[22] N. J. Cerf, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 187 (2000).

[23] V. Scarani, S. Iblisdir, N.Gisin and A. Acin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1225 (2005), and references therein.

[24] S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhary, J. Phys. A **39**, 8439 (2006).

[25] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **242**, 1 (1998).
[26] L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4999 (1998); L.Hardy and D. D. Song, Phys. Lett. A **259**, 331 (1999).
[27] Sk Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, A. Datta and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 062311 (2015).
[28] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989)
[29] B. Bellomo, R. Lo Franco and G. Compagno, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032342 (2008);
[30] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev., **47** 777 (1935).
[31] Andrew G. White, Daniel F. V. James, P. H. Eberhard, P.G. Kwiat, Physical Review Letters **83**, no. 16, pp. 3103-3107 (1999)
[32] Charles H. Bennett, Herbert J. Bernstein, Sandu Popescu, Benjamin Schumacher, Phys.Rev.A **53** :2046-2052 (1996).
[33] M. Murao, M.B. Plenio, S. Popescu, V. Vedral and P.L. Knight, Phys.Rev. A, **57**, 4075 (1998).
[34] V. Buzek, V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, P. L. Knight and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 3327 (1997).
[35] S. Adhikari and B. S. Choudhury, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 032323 (2006); I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhary arXiv:0804.2568.
[36] S. Bandyopadhyay and G. Kar, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3296 (1999).
[37] S. Chatterjee, Sk Sazim, I Chakrabarty, arXiv:1411.4397
[38] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[39] I. Ghiu, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012323 (2003).